Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Gentiana Saponaria, L. Tottenville.

Asclepias variegata, L. Tottenville. (Wm. H. Rudkin.)

Atriplex rosea, L.—Waste places, Clifton.

Polygonum incarnatum, Ell.—New Brighton. (Miss C. O. Thompson.) Not, as first supposed, common.

Rumex pulcher, L.—Stapleton Flats ; introduced in ballast. (Miss C. O. Thompson.)

Ulmus fulva, Michx.—Egbertville.

Quercus bicolor. Willd.—Green Ridge and Egbertville.

Quercus prinoides, Willd.—Watchogue.

Betula nigra, L.—A few trees near Bull's Head.

Sparganium simplex, Huds., var *Nuttallii*, Engelm.—"Tottenville, 1871." (Wm. H. Leggett.)

Potamogeton pulcher, Tuck.—Silver Lake.

Potamogeton amplifolius, Tuck.—Clove Lake.

Sagittaria variabilis, Engelm., var. *obtusa*, Gr.—Common.

Sagittaria variabilis, Engelm., var. *hastata*, Gr.—Common. (These varieties should replace *S. variabilis*, Engelm., in our catalogue.)

Habenaria ciliaris, R. Br.—Watchogue. (E. M. Eadie.)

Smilax Pseudo-China, L.—Linden Park Swamp.

Juncus dichotomus, Ell.—"Tottenville, 1871." (Wm. H. Leggett.)

Heleocharis prolifera, Torr. (?)—Found only in one clear deep spring, at Port Richmond. Has never been found in fruit, and hence the determination may prove to be wrong.

Heleocharis olivacea, Torr.—" Tottenville." (Wm. H. Leggett.)

Scleria triglomerata, Michx.—Linden Park.

Carex rosea, Schk., var. *radiata*, Desv.—"Huguenot, 1871." (Wm. H. Leggett.)

Carex Muhlenbergii, Schk., var. *enervis*, Boot.—New Dorp and Garretsons.

Carex debilis, Michx.—" Rossville, 1869." (Wm. H. Leggett.)

Eragrostis poœoides, Beauv.—Streets of Port Richmond.

Eragrostis Purshii, Schrader.—New Brighton and Court House.

Phalaris Canariensis, L.—New Dorp and New Brighton.

Isoetes echinospora, Durieu, var. *Braunii*, Engelm. (?)—Only one specimen, found near Huguenot; not in fruit, the determination may therefore not be correct.

N. L. BRITTON.
ARTHUR HOLLICK.

A new Locality for Nelumbium.—In a swamp a few miles to the west of Osterville, Mass., a village on the southern side of Cape Cod, *Nelumbium luteum*, Wild., grows more or less abundantly. Probably this is the most eastern locality of the species. One cannot say whether it originally grew here, because the swamp is near the reservation of the Marshpee Indians and it is quite possible that the *Nelumbium* was introduced by them. The swamp is visited by summer visitors at Osterville, but the existence of the *Nelumbium* so far east was, as far as I can ascertain, unsuspected by our botanists. The existence of a patch of *Genista tinctoria*, L., in the heart of Cambridge, and close to one of the dormitories occupied by Harvard students, surprised me very much until, about three years ago, in passing Felton Hall I noticed a vacant lot close by covered with a mass of yellow bloom. Except near Salem, the plant is rarely seen in Eastern Massachusetts.

W. G. FARLOW.

Botanical Notes.

On Derivation in Pinus edulis and Pinus monophylla.—At a meeting of the Botanical Section of the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences on December 8th, Mr. Thomas Meehan called attention to some dried specimens of *Pinus monophylla* on the table, which were received in a fresh condition, a few months ago, from Mrs. Lewers, of Franktown, Nevada. At that time the phyllodes which took the place of the real leaves were all monophyllous. In drying, several had opened in some specimens, and others readily separated by a little aid, showing that the species might have been two-leaved but for some inability in the early stages of development to separate them. This monophyllous species was closely allied to *Pinus edulis*, which was confined to the Rocky Mountains, the monophyllous species being the form that prevailed further west. But in a small tree of *P. edulis* growing in a deep ravine in Queen Cañon, in the Rocky Mountains he had on the same tree found monophyllous, diphyllous, and triphyllous phyllodes, and there could not possibly be any doubt that the species were of one origin. The case was one worthy of note, because it had been charged that there was no actual evidence of the truth of the doctrine of derivation. Generally, when such evidences as these were offered, the objector was prepared to abandon his belief in the specific distinctness of the forms rather than to grant that two distinct species had been developed from one parent, and even in the case of these species there were some who regarded one as but a variety of the other. But there were other distinctions: The cones were not quite the same, and the seeds were very different in size and outline, so that one could readily separate the seeds if mixed together. There was, in fact, a whole series of distinctions fully as great as we could find in many well-recognized species, and which fully entitled the two forms to full specific rank, though in the face of the evident facts that they are derivations of one original parentage. Indeed, it was well known that when a plant changed its character in one respect it must do so in others; plants in some climates annual would become perennial or suffrutescent in others. The cotton-plant was a familiar example. In such cases the foliage and other characters varied from those connected with the annual form, and from this fact some botanists had regarded *Gossypium herbaceum* and *Gossypium arboreum* as distinct species. In the case of these two species of *Pinus*, the one which could not develop its phyllodes with two separate individuals would of necessity present some peculiarities in the scales of the cone, as these were, morphologically, but transformed phyllodes. Under morphological laws, that which affected the leaves ought to affect the carpels or other parts of fructification which were modified from them.

The true position of the species in development was that *Pinus*